



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,655	02/09/2000	Scott C. Cottrille	777.327US1	2927

26389 7590 06/03/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No

09/500,655

Applicant(s)

COTTRILLE ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-31, 67-69, 101-103 and 105-119 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-31, 67-69, 101-103 and 105-119 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment B filed 02/20/2004 to the original application filed 02/09/2000.
2. Claims 29-31, 67-69, 101-103 and 105-119 are currently pending in this application. Claims 29-30, 67-68, and 101-102 have been amended. Claims 29, 67, and 101 are independent claims.

Examiner's Note

3. The following set of rejections regarding claims 29, 67, and 101 are based upon the Examiner's interpretation of "and/or" equal "or".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 29, 67, and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to independent claims 29, 67, and 101, the phrases "localized versions" (line 5) are vague and indefinite because they are unclear which versions are referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 29-31, 67-69, 101-103 and 105-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (U.S. 6,623,529 – filed 01/1999).

As to independent claim 29, Lakritz teaches (*col.2, lines 17-27*) the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented method for generating localized versions (*provide a document localization*) of a localizable Internet document (*multilingual Internet Web site*) for delivery to a client (*delivery to Web site visitor*), the method comprising:

- extracting a localizable portion of the localizable Internet document, the localizable portion is localized according to different languages and/or geographical locations (*automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor ... deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more country/language database and/or file-based content in a file system to the visitor's browser; col.4, lines 3-19/ create localized content for specific geographic regions or countries; col.6, lines 50-57/ automatically localized for different languages; col.26, lines 33-35 and Fig.12*); and

- translating each localizable version to a plurality of encoded versions (*encoding of the text to properly interpret for subsequent translation; col.4, lines 29-34/A Translation Resource performs translation or other linguistic functions on a set of input documents and their constituent or dependent components and produces a set of output documents that have*

transformed linguistically; col.12, lines 29-32 /a single form or CGI- generated document can be constructed so that it will be automatically localized for different languages and locales; col.36, lines 31-35/ A single CG script or form can be localized for multiple languages from a single copy of source code; col.28, lines 15-16).

While teaching the localized versions of the localizable portion and the encoded versions, Lakritz does not explicitly teach “storing localized versions of the localizable portion and the encoded version in the directory hierarchy.”

Lakritz, however, teaches “*Content is hierarchically stored as country and language independent elements*” (col.6, lines 44-46) and “*each language be assigned a unique directory in the document tree. All documents in that languages are placed in the corresponding directory. The entire document tree then becomes a collection of parallel language directories*” (col.17, lines 44-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply Lakritz’s teaching for “storing localized versions of the localizable portion and the encoded version in the directory hierarchy” in order to provide means for facilitating the localization of documents, data streams, and non-text files for multilingual Internet Web sites, enabling the Web site manager to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document, thereby enhancing the maintainability and storage of multilingual electronic content.

As to dependent claim 30, Lakritz teaches extracting string literal from the localizable document; and storing the string literal as symbols (col. 27, lines 23-28 and col.29, lines 28-67).

As to dependent claim 31, Lakritz teaches the encoded versions represent DBCS, Unicode, and UTF-8 versions of the corresponding localized version (col.4, lines 46-54).

As to dependent claim 105, Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is an electronic mail document (*Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27*).

As to dependent claim 106, Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is a Web page document (*Abstract and col.3, lines 25-38*).

As to dependent claim 107, Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is an electronic communication (*Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27*).

As to dependent claim 108, Lakritz teaches the electronic communication is electronic mail (*Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27*).

As to dependent claim 109, Lakritz teaches the localizable Internet document is a portion of a Web page document (*Abstract and col.2, lines 17-27*).

As to independent claim 67, it is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 29, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 68-69 and 110-114, they include the same limitations as in claims 30-31 and 105-109, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 101, it is directed to a computer for performing the method of claim 29, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 102-103 and 115-119, they include the same limitations as in claims 30-32 and 105-109, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/20/2004 have been fully considered, but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

The newly applied prior art (Lakritz) meets the claims as amended by Applicant.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dedrick	U.S Patent No. 5,717,923	issued: Feb. 10, 1998
Rose et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,138,086	issued: Oct. 24, 2000
Chaddha	U.S Patent No. 6,345,293	issued: Feb. 5, 2002
Chaddha	U.S Patent No. 6,647,425	issued: Nov. 11, 2003

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 27, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER